

6-1980

A Study of Significant Differences in Values, Problems & Personality Characteristics of English 055 Students & English 101 Students at Western Kentucky University

Nancy Moore

Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Academic Advising Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moore, Nancy, "A Study of Significant Differences in Values, Problems & Personality Characteristics of English 055 Students & English 101 Students at Western Kentucky University" (1980). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 2649.
<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2649>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Moore,
Nancy Milligan
1980

A STUDY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN VALUES, PROBLEMS,
AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH 055 STUDENTS
AND ENGLISH 101 STUDENTS AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

A Project

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Specialist in Education

by

Nancy Milligan Moore

June 1980

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

☒ granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research or scholarly purposes.

☐ reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed Nancy Milligan Moore

Date June 27, 1980

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

A STUDY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN VALUES, PROBLEMS,
AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH 055 STUDENTS
AND ENGLISH 101 STUDENTS AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Recommended June 25, 1980
(Date)

Ernest W. Burke
(Director of Thesis)

Vernon Lee Sheeley
Robert J. Hayden

Approved July 3, 1980
(Date)

Charles Gray
(Dean of the Graduate College)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Rationale	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Definitions of Terms	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
History of Higher Education	10
Open Admissions	11
Illiteracy: Teaching Remedial English	14
Summary	19
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	21
Sampling	21
Instruments	22
Scoring	26
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	27
<u>The Willoughby Schedule</u>	27
<u>Mooney Problem Check Lists</u>	28
<u>Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values</u>	30
<u>Edwards Personal Preference Schedule</u>	31
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
REFERENCES	39

A STUDY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN VALUES, PROBLEMS,
AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH 055 STUDENTS
AND ENGLISH 101 STUDENTS AT WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Nancy Milligan Moore June 1980

40 pages

Directed by: Emmett Burkeen, Vernon Sheeley, and
Delbert Hayden

Department of Counselor Education, Western Kentucky University

Fifty students from English 055 and 50 students from English 101 were given the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Mooney Problem Check Lists, the Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values, and the Willoughby Schedule to determine if any significant differences existed between the two groups in the areas of personality characteristics, values, or problems. A statistical analysis of the results was determined by means of a t value from a separate variance estimate. Results indicated that significant differences existed between the 055 students and the 101 students in the following areas: self-esteem, economic values, need for achievement, and number of problems. There were no other significant differences. Since colleges and universities are accepting more and more students who are academically too weak to pursue the traditional course of study, it is recommended that special consideration be given to the needs of these remedial students and that an attempt be made to educate each as a whole individual.

Chapter I

Introduction

Background

Following World War II, America decided to show its gratitude towards its veterans by insuring that all of them were guaranteed the opportunity to attend college. By the mid-1950's this idea had expanded to include all high school graduates. Thus the land that was the first to insist that every child had the right to learn to read and write, hence to an elementary education, became and still remains the only great nation to attempt to provide a higher education for all (Bird, 1975). One result has been the introduction of more and more remedial courses that attempt to bring high-school-graduated yet poorly-prepared students to the academic level where they can actively pursue a college degree. Such a case in point is Western Kentucky University (WKU)'s remedial English course, English 055.

Rationale

In the fall of 1975, WKU's English Department offered English 055 for the first time. Twenty-four sections of English 055 cost WKU approximately \$30,000

(Miller, 1976). The rationale for offering this course was that WKU has an obligation to educate to the best of its ability any student permitted to attend. Since WKU consistently admits students who are in the bottom 10th percentile of their graduating classes, plus some students who also were in special education classes in their high schools, English teachers (and most certainly others, too) at WKU had long known that there were many semi-literate students sitting in classes. There are many reasons cited why students can't write--low I. Q., poor motivation, too much TV, crowded high school classrooms, phase electives--but one fact remains: students can't write because they have not been taught to write (Miller, 1976). Therefore, when WKU's English Department developed its 055 course it was attempting to segregate those students exhibiting the most glaring writing flaws and to teach them intensively.

Statement of the Problem

The problem that exists when one attempts to teach students who are labeled "remedial" is what to do, how to teach these students differently from the so-called regular students. Is it necessary to vary content? Method? Approach? Attitude? Should the teacher be sterner? Nicer? Matter-of-fact? How, in essence, can a teacher of fifteen to eighteen English 055 students do in one semester what has not been done for these students

in twelve years? As an English teacher involved in teaching English 055 at WKU for several years, this writer has become increasingly aware that the teacher must approach the whole student, not just that part of the student that must be taught to dot i's, cross t's and eliminate fragments. Many 055 students bring with them to class a haughty "you can't teach me anything" attitude.

Whether this attitude masks an insecurity in the use of language skills or presents a true picture of students' boredom and lack of interest in learning, the problem for the teacher is how to overcome this resistance and help the students achieve to their fullest potential. If these remedial students do, in fact, have decidedly different self-concepts, values, personalities, and problems than do the English 101 "regular" students, then not only should the academic content of remedial courses be different from the academic requirements of other courses, but also the teacher's approach to teaching these remedial courses should be different.

Purpose of the Study

There were several purposes to this study. The investigation was designed to determine the self-concepts, values, personalities, and problems of a selected sampling of both English 055 and English 101 students. Another purpose was to ascertain whether or not there were any noticeable differences in these four factors between the

two groups of students tested. A third purpose was to determine what, if anything, a teacher of remedial English students could do to make the students more approachable, more liable to learning.

For this study, fifty English 101 students representing two classes and fifty English 055 students representing three classes were administered four instruments: the Willoughby Schedule, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values, and Mooney Problem Check Lists (college form). These four instruments were chosen because of their proven reliability in measuring self-concepts, values, personality characteristics, and problems.

Limitations of the Study

Because of the tremendous task that would have been involved in both the testing and scoring of instruments of all of the English 055 and English 101 students enrolled in WKU's English Department during the fall of 1979, this study was limited to fifty 055 students and fifty 101 students. It was felt that this sampling would be adequate because the students involved represented a sampling of all English 055 and English 101 students according to total composition of classes in sex, race, and background. Students were not asked to identify themselves other than by class (055 or 101). Once the scoring was done, all 055 students and all 101 students

were grouped according to class to determine the mean and "t" score of each class on each test category.

No allowance was made for such variables as social, economic, or cultural backgrounds of the students. No attempt was made to check high school backgrounds or grades or to check current college grades or majors of the students tested. No attempt was made to investigate family constellations or parental educational status. Although all of these factors make up the whole student, it was the purpose of this study to investigate, analyze, and make recommendations concerning the students on the basis of their current images of themselves. The emphasis was on the here-and-now and what to do with it.

Definitions of Terms

For the sake of clarity, the following definitions were chosen:

Remedial student refers to any student enrolled in English 055. The 055 English student falls in the range 0 to 13 on the English verbal section of the ACT test. The remedial student is further tested during the first two class meetings of English 055 by taking the California Achievement Test in Language (CAT, c. 1970) and by writing a paragraph to exhibit his/her writing skills. These tests are used to verify placement in English 055.

Regular student refers to any student enrolled in English 101. The 101 English student scores above 13 on the

English verbal section of the ACT test.

English 055 is the remedial course in English skills developed for those students who fail to exhibit success with minimal basic writing skills.

English 101 is the first (with the exception of English 055) English course taught to students enrolled at WKU. The development of skills in grammar and in writing mechanics is stressed.

Basic writing skills are those skills necessary for one to communicate effectively via the written word in a form acceptable to an educated person.

The Mooney Problem Check Lists, form C--College, 1950 Revisions (also referred to as Mooney) are those check lists developed during the 1940's and revised in 1950 to help students express their personal problems. Mooney contains the following problem areas: Health and Physical Development (HPD); Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment (FLE); Social and Recreational Activities (SRA); Social-Psychological Relations (SPR); Courtship, Sex, and Marriage (CSM); Home and Family (HF); Morals and Religion (MR); Adjustment to College (School) Work (ACW, ASW); The Future: Vocational and Educational (FVE); and Curriculum and Teaching Procedure (CTP).

Study of Values by Allport/Vernon/Lindzey refers to the

instrument developed in 1931 and revised in 1951 and 1960 to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. Definitions of these terms follow and are as defined in Study of Values, third edition.

1. Theoretical: The theoretical person is interested in the discovery of truth. His/her goal is to order and systematize knowledge.
2. Economic: The economical person is interested in what is useful. He/she is practical.
3. Aesthetic: The aesthetical person values form and harmony.
4. Social: The highest value for the social being is love of people.
5. Political: The political individual is interested in power.
6. Religious: The religious person values unity.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), revised in 1959, provides measures of fifteen personality variables. Definitions of these terms follow and are as defined in EPPS, 1959 revised edition.

1. Achievement (ach): To do one's best, to be able to things better than others.
2. Deference (def): To let others make decisions.
3. Order (ord): To be neat and organized; to have

things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. Exhibition (exh): To say witty and clever things; to be the center of attention.
5. Autonomy (aut): To feel free to do what one wants; to criticize those in authority.
6. Affiliation (aff): To form strong attractions; to be loyal.
7. Intraception (int): To analyze one's motives and feelings; to put oneself in another's place.
8. Succorance (suc): To seek encouragement from others; to seek sympathy, affections, and favors.
9. Dominance (dom): To argue for one's point of view; to tell others how to do their jobs.
10. Abasement (aba): To feel guilty; to accept blame; to feel timid and inferior; to give in.
11. Nurturance (nur): To help friends in trouble; to show affection; to be a confidant.
12. Change (chg): To do new and different things.
13. Endurance (end): To keep at a job until it is finished; to persevere even when progress is nil.
14. Heterosexuality (het): To go out with members of the opposite sex; to discuss sex.
15. Aggression (agg): To attack contrary points of view; to get revenge.

The Willoughby Schedule is an instrument designed to

measure self-concept. It is widely used by the College of Education at WKU in the area of self-concept identification.

Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

History of Higher Education

The history of higher education in America reveals three major philosophies about who should go to college. The first college students of the young America were traditionally the wealthy aristocrats. These students attended such schools as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton and had money and family social status. It was assumed that these people would most benefit from college; others would not follow a life pattern that made use of a college education. The revolt against aristocratic philosophies of college admissions was led by those who believed a college education to be an earned right, not a birthright. Land-grant universities heralded the rise of meritocracy. The working-man had the right to send his children to college, and these young people had the right to prepare themselves for professional careers. Advocates of meritocracy felt college admissions should be based on academic merit, that grades and test scores should be used to select the most promising young people to attend college. Meritocracy reached its peak in the 1950's. Just as the aristocrats had erected barriers to education, so had the

advocates of meritocracy. The campaigns of the 1950's sought to bring into the colleges the very good student who had no money, no family status, but much academic talent. By the early 1970's the pressure was strong to further democratize higher education by bringing it into reach of a much broader segment of the population (Cross, 1971).

Open Admissions

The mingling of meritocracy and egalitarianism is causing considerable controversy among educators. An apt sign of the times was this 1970 headline in Time, reading "Open Admissions: American Dream or Disaster?" The City University of New York (CUNY) instituted egalitarianism by opening its doors to all 1970 New York City high school graduates, regardless of academic qualifications (Cross, 1971).

Remediation and the sinking level of the college student were hotly debated by Wagner (1976) and Gray (1978). Both English teachers at CUNY, these two discussed the value of open admissions and the subsequent de-valuing of the English language. Wagner deplored the situation wherein he found himself attempting to teach language skills to uneducated, uninterested, surly students--mostly Blacks. Gray countered this by accusing Wagner of racism, sexism, and classism, and by insisting that Wagner had lost his humanism by failing to attempt to reach

students so unlike himself as a student. Wagner insisted that remediation is a tool for the politicians, a compensation for past injustices, whereas Gray saw it as a means of realizing the wealth of human potential.

Another discussion of the CUNY problem of open admissions and remediation was provided by Hallmundsson (1976). She attempted to rise above "money, ethnics, or CUNY politics" (p. 159) by declaring herself a teacher concerned with her students, not with her own credentials. She shared her thoughts about the difficulties of teaching remedial English and her method of dealing with the problem. She used the dictionary as her textbook and personal situations as her format. She said that the teacher should create situations based on the apprehensions of the remedial students who know that they are not nearly as well-prepared as other students in other classes. She felt her program to be successful because she saw the dictionary becoming a part of the students' routines. The conclusion drawn here was that a recognition of the value of and a dependence upon the dictionary constituted a huge stride forward in basic education.

The 1970 President's Task Force on Higher Education recommended financial aid to "students of all races who have the desire and ability to profit from post-high school education" (Cross, 1971, p. 4). Can we be equal and excellent? What happens to the value of a higher education when everyone has one? The gap between the so-called New

Students and traditional higher education is large. Consequently, all kinds of ways have been devised to make New Students better fit to participate in traditional higher education: remedial courses to remove academic deficiencies, counseling services to remove motivational deficiencies, and financial aid to remove financial deficiencies (Cross, 1971).

One thing is certain: many more students with academic abilities far below average will be entering college. These students are those who score in the lowest third among national samples of young people on traditional tests of academic ability. The reason for singling out students with educational problems as those who need help the most is obvious: young people entering college in the 1970's and 1980's "are distinguished more by low test scores than by any other single measure available, including race, sex, and socioeconomic status" (Cross, 1971, p. 14).

Dugan (1970) wrote that to offer higher education to everyone means that we need a broader interpretation of talent. He suggested that viewing individuals apart from test scores would help the universities provide superior and creative educational offerings without (underlining mine) sacrificing academic standards. He also maintained that colleges and universities could not be expected to make up long-term educational deficiencies without help.

Programs such as Head Start for preschoolers and Upward Bound for disadvantaged highschoolers have been very successful. Dugan further stated that educational institutions will have to change if the goal of educational opportunity for all is to be realized. Innovative programs will have to emerge. He concluded: "Our greatest challenge is to develop each individual to the full extent of his potential and thus to allow for greater improvements in the quality of our lives and our society" (1970, p. 53).

Illiteracy: Teaching Remedial English

Throughout the literature relating to the problems of the college student, especially to the academically ill-prepared, the prevalent theme seems to be what to do about illiteracy. Many people strongly advocate the so-called "Back to Basics Movement," with its emphasis on the fundamentals of reading, writing, and computing. Miller (1977) reported the following: a 1976 \$88,000 grant to the University of South Carolina from the National Endowment for the Humanities to combat writing illiteracy in that state; a 1977 malpractice suit against a high school for failing to teach its students to read; a 1977 report from the University of California deploring the sorry state of language competence in that state. Concern about illiteracy is not limited to any one region of the United States.

Sanford (1970) stated that to give proper attention to the development of the whole person, testing will have to change in emphasis. In order to teach a person more effectively, educators will have to pay attention to human characteristics now given scant attention. The accent, insisted Sanford, will have to be upon what is needed now in order to assist the further development of the individual student.

Time (Milk vs. cream? March 31, 1980) reported that at the University of Minnesota incoming freshmen in 1978 were given the same reading test given to University of Minnesota freshmen in 1928. Results: 1978 students did much worse than their 1928 counterparts. Altogether, estimates Alvin C. Eurich, the man who devised the test in 1928, students today have greater difficulty understanding what they read. Further, reported Time, in 1928 only 12% of Minnesota's college-age population went to college, whereas in 1978 that figure was 45.5% (which is also Time's figure for the percent of college-age youth in the United States who currently attend college). The Minnesota study compares "1978 milk to 1928 cream" (p. 39); it perhaps best illustrates the condition of higher education in America today.

Wilcox (1973) stated that in 1960 a survey conducted by the National Council of Teachers of English revealed that 55.6% of all four-year colleges and universities provided special remedial instruction for students

deficient in the use of English. By 1967 only 27% continued to offer remedial English. A reversal of this trend has since occurred as more institutions have offered open admissions to all students. Wilcox said that at least 10% of those students admitted to college were unable to demonstrate proficiency in the English language expected of high school graduates and were thus placed in a remedial course, the content of which was on an elementary level comparable to those used in junior high schools. There is rarely any intellectual substance to these remedial English courses.

Students and teachers alike are discontent with these watered-down versions of learning. Widespread skepticism remains about the efficacy of remedial programs. Noted Wilcox:

There is reason to doubt that any course of instruction, no matter how carefully designed and compassionately taught, can 'remedy' the verbal faults committed by eighteen-year-old students who cannot cope with the regular freshman program; institutions like the University of Nevada report that less than 5 percent of those students who begin with remedial English ever graduate. (pp. 68-69)

Coyne and Hebert (1972) stated that the traditional college education is not needed by everyone. Yet, in defense of language skills, they reported: "If you can write English clearly, you'll never go hungry" (p. 41). They also mentioned a vice-president of a large management consulting firm, who had several complaints about the college graduates he employed. The majority can't

write, can't do simple math, and can't manage time. These skills, he said, were more important than degrees (p. 42).

Glazier (1979) researched the area of teaching remedial English and found that many students who have repeatedly resisted the rules of English composition for twelve years may profit from a simplified approach. Thus she published The Least You Should Know About English: Basic Writing Skills, a workbook that appeals both psychologically and literally to those remedial students who seek help yet are wary of rules and jargon. Glazier insisted that being able to write Standard English is essential in college and will probably be an asset to any career. She concluded her text with the admonition to students that they can master basic communication skills if they want to.

Otto, McMenemy, and Smith (1973) insisted that the problem of underachievement was vast and definitely not confined to any particular segment of society. They also said that to effectively help these students the educator must consider factors other than purely academic. The writers made one main point: students from vastly different backgrounds with distinctly different personal characteristics may share a common need for help if they are to break out of the failure-frustration pattern so often associated with lack of achievement. Even so, a common need does not suggest a routine approach to meeting the need--unique individuals are still involved. Most

people can run their lives more efficiently if they are able to write and express ideas coherently. Therefore, an extremely important function of the school is special instruction in writing skills. Otto et al. (1973) support five principles basic to improving writing skills:

- (1) writing is basically a thinking process and must be conceptualized as such by students and teachers . . .
- (2) writing is always done for a particular purpose and a particular audience . . .
- (3) desire to commit an idea to writing is basic to writing improvement
- (4) development in writing can proceed only on a base of oral language development
- (5) frequent practice and audience feedback are essential to the improvement of written composition. (p. 390)

Dudley (1978) researched the growing concern with students who possess written communication skills deficiencies and said that, regardless of their causes, these deficiencies must be attacked. He also cited the usual unrealistic practice of expecting learning skills deficiencies to be removed within one year or less, and the inadequate attempts to evaluate remedial programs. Dudley concluded by suggesting that marginal students are more likely to remain and succeed in college if they have a Learning Skills Center made available to them over several semesters instead of just for one or two semesters.

Agress (1979) discussed her attempt to remedy twelve years of English deficiency in one summer term of six weeks. She maintained that the traditional concepts of language can be taught to the academically poorly prepared

and that to treat these students as different and incapable was to do them a grave injustice. She wrote:

Although there has been a considerable amount of criticism in recent years about the teaching of traditional English grammar to inner city students, I have never wavered in my conviction that in a predominantly middle-class society, if one is to be integrated into the 'system,' one should be taught the rules and practices of that system. I believe that instructors who encourage Black English and local regionalisms in defense of so-called creative ethnicity are really playing a cruel joke on their students, who, with a college degree, but without effective communicative skills, will never be absorbed into the mainstream of society. (p. 116)

Agress stressed reading, writing, and relating on a personal basis.

Summary

This writer's research and review of literature relating to remediation at the college level, specifically to the teaching of remedial English, has been quite extensive and revealing. The first argument that rages is over remediation itself: is a college really a college when it accepts poorly prepared students and puts them in elementary level courses? Is the value of a college education to be put strictly on academic levels, as many traditionalists would have us believe, or should educators look more to developing the whole individual and thus benefiting all society, as humanists insist? Finally, assuming that many colleges and universities will continue to have an open admissions policy, how best are we to help

the students who are poorly prepared at best, illiterate at worst? The research in this paper is directed at this last question. There has been very little actual research done on how to best find out what these remedial students need and what kinds of programs to develop to meet these needs. Some research findings that approach this idea are Bhatnagar's "A Study of Some EPPS Variables as Factors of Academic Achievement" (1969), Hickson and Driskill's "Needs for Achievement: Differences Between Honors and Non-Honors Students" (1970), McClelland's "An Investigation of Selected Non-Intellectual Variables and Their Relationship to College Academic Achievement" (1969), and Rezler's "The Influence of Needs Upon the Student's Perception of His Instructor" (1965). Clearly the need exists for research into how the self-concepts, values, personalities, and problems of remedial students and regular students differ.

Chapter III

Design of the Study

Sampling

During the 1979 fall semester at WKU, there were 66 sections of English 101 with an approximate enrollment of 1600 students and 30 sections of English 055 with an approximate enrollment of 500 students. The student sampling for this study was chosen by selecting two 101 classes with a student population of 24 and 26 and three 055 classes with a student population of 18, 17, and 15. Two class sessions were necessary for each section in order to complete all four instruments. The Willoughby Schedule and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule were given first, taking approximately 5 minutes and 45 minutes respectively to complete. The Mooney Problem Check Lists and the Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values were then given at the next session, taking approximately 20 minutes and 30 minutes respectively to complete. This writer administered all the instruments and instructed the students as to proper procedure. The students were told that identity was not necessary. They were asked only to indicate on each instrument their class, either 055 or 101.

Instruments

The Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values (1960) is a scale for measuring dominant interests in personality. The primary purposes of the instrument are to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: the theoretical, economical, aesthetic, social, political, and religious.

There are six final scores in the computation, one for each variable mentioned. The instrument is constructed so that 40 is the average for any single value. Only relative, not absolute, value is measured. Thus a high score on one variable can be obtained only by reducing correspondingly the scores on one or more of the other values.

Internal reliability (homogeneity) of the Study of Values has been determined by the split-half and the item analysis. The final item analysis shows a positive correlation for each item with the total score for its value significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The Study of Values is standardized on a college population. One suggested use for this instrument is in psychological research, particularly in the area of group differences. Research indicates that the Study of Values has been widely used and continues to be a highly accurate instrument for measuring personality characteristics.

The Mooney Problem Check Lists (1950 revision) is an

instrument designed to help students express their personal problems. Form C, college level, was used for this research. A major reason suggested for using this instrument is to enable special analysis of students who are hard to reach or understand. The college form contains 330 items, 30 in each of 11 different areas: health, finances, social activities, social-psychological relations, personal-psychological relations, sex, home, morals, adjustment, the future, and curriculum. Students are asked to underline problem items that pertain to them, and then to circle those problem areas that cause them great concern. Totals are derived for both the circled items and total items checked in each area.

The validity of the Mooney is attested to by the fact that over a half million of the pre-1950 instruments have been used. Also, Mooney has been one of the main research tools used for collecting data of sociological, psychological, and educational importance to school administrators, counselors, psychologists, and others.

Reliability of an instrument such as the Mooney is not determined as is reliability of a test for which scores are obtained. The check list is designed to reflect problems which a student may have and express at a given time. Evidence supports the belief that the Mooney reflects concerns of a group which remain reasonably stable over a period of time. One study by Gordon found

a correlation coefficient of .93 while a second study revealed rank order correlation coefficients from .90 to .98. Therefore, though the Mooney is designed to reflect problems of the individual, it exhibits sufficient stability for program planning based on survey results. Research indicates acceptance of the Mooney as a valid, reliable instrument for measuring student problems.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), revised in 1959, was designed for research and counseling purposes, to provide measures of fifteen independent normal personality variables. Those variables are achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, nurturance, change, endurance, heterosexuality, and aggression. In addition, the EPPS provides a measure of test consistency and profile stability. The EPPS attempts to minimize the influence of social desirability. Students are asked to choose between two statements representing different personality traits, but the statements are equal with respect to their social desirability. Thus, social desirability exerts less influence on the individual and test results are more reflective of the individual's personality.

Each of the fifteen personality variables in the EPPS is paired twice with each of the other variables. The maximum score on a particular variable is 28; the minimum score is 0. The higher the scores on a particular

variable, the more often the subjects have chosen the statements for this variable as being descriptive of themselves in preference to the statements for the other variables. The lower the score on a particular variable, the less often the subjects have chosen the statement for this variable as being descriptive of themselves. The consistency variable indicates whether or not an individual has been consistent in making choices and indicates the presence or absence of chance. A consistency score less than 9 might indicate that the scores on an individual's fifteen personality variables should be questioned.

Reliability of the EPFS has been determined using both the split-half and test-retest reliability coefficients. Several studies point to the validity of the instrument, and literature indicates an enormous reliance on the EPFS as a useful tool for psychological research.

The Willoughby Schedule was the simplest instrument administered. It consisted of 25 "negative" questions, such as "are you shy?" which the student was to answer by drawing a circle around the appropriate number: 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. Zero meant never or no, 1 meant sometimes, 2 meant an average amount, 3 meant usually, and 4 meant practically always. The student's score was then determined by adding the scores and dividing by 25. The higher the score, the lower the student's self-concept.

The Willoughby Schedule has been accepted as both

valid and reliable in indicating various emotional personality traits, and literature pertaining to the use of this instrument indicates that it has often been employed as the basic research tool in various psychological research areas.

Scoring

All instruments administered were hand-scored by this writer. Results were then transferred to computer code sheets which were taken to the WKU Computer Center and punched out on a card deck. These cards were then used to run a t-Test analysis for each instrument.

Chapter IV

Analysis of Data

Chapter IV presents the findings of data relevant to the statements of the problem. Special attention was given to those variables which indicated a significant difference existed between the 055 and the 101 English students. Tables are presented with the descriptive data for easy reference. All tables use N for number of cases, SD for standard deviation, SE_m for standard error, t for t value, df for degrees of freedom, and LS for level of significance.

Descriptive Data

Willoughby Schedule

The Willoughby results are quite significant to this study. As Table 1 indicates, there was a significant difference in the means of the two groups, with the 055's having a significantly higher score and thus a significantly lower self-esteem than the 101's. The t value significance at the .01 level is a further indicator of major differences between the two groups.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Willoughby

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE _m	Separate Variance Estimate		
					t	df	LS
055	50	1.6840	0.596	0.084	3.89	85.48	.001
101	50	1.2904	0.398	0.056			

Mooney

Table 2 reports data on the Mooney. Using the t value, those items which indicate a significant difference between the two sample groups are HPD, health and physical development; SRA, social and recreational activities; SPR, social-psychological relations; PPR, personal-psychological relations; CSM, courtship, sex, and marriage; MR, morals and religion; FVE, the future: vocational and educational; and CTP, curriculum and teaching procedure. Of the eleven variables measured, only FLE, finances, living conditions, and employment; HF, home and family; and ACW, adjustment to college (work) indicate no significant difference between the two groups.

TABLE 2

Analysis of Mooney

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE _m	Separate Variance Estimate		
					t	df	LS
HPD 055	50	3.1000	4.581	0.648	2.76	57.24	0.008
HPD 101	50	1.2400	1.333	0.189			
FLE 055	50	2.9800	4.614	0.652	1.83	69.38	0.071
FLE 101	50	1.6600	2.153	0.305			
SRA 055	50	2.7800	4.171	0.590	2.77	63.92	0.007
SRA 101	50	1.0200	1.647	0.233			
SPR 055	50	2.7800	4.460	0.631	2.96	54.81	0.005
SPR 101	50	0.8600	1.088	0.154			
PPR 055	50	2.7000	4.912	0.695	2.18	57.66	0.033
PPR 101	50	1.1200	1.466	0.207			
CSM 055	50	3.2000	4.571	0.646	2.78	60.74	0.007
CSM 101	50	1.3000	1.594	0.225			
HF 055	50	2.8400	4.666	0.660	2.21	65.72	0.031
HF 101	50	1.2600	1.957	0.277			
MR 055	50	3.4600	4.790	0.677	3.51	55.59	0.001
MR 101	50	1.0000	1.245	0.176			
ACW 055	50	3.8400	4.913	0.695	2.41	63.73	0.019
ACW 101	50	2.0400	1.927	0.272			
FVE 055	50	3.6000	5.198	0.735	3.15	55.92	0.003
FVE 101	50	1.2000	1.385	0.196			
CTP 055	50	3.1000	4.904	0.694	3.65	52.86	0.001
CTP 101	50	0.5200	0.974	0.138			

Study of Values

Table 3 reports data derived from administering the Study of Values. Of the six variables measured by this instrument, a significant difference in the t value of the two groups was revealed in only one area, economics. The mean for the 101 group was considerably higher than that of the 055 group, and the t value was significant at the .04 level, thus indicating that the 101 students were far more concerned with their current and future economic condition than were the 055 students. All other differences were insignificant.

TABLE 3
Analysis of Study of Values

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE _m	Separate Variance Estimate		
					t	df	LS
THEOR 055	50	37.82	5.329	0.754	0.52	88.51	0.602
THEOR 101	50	38.50	7.487	1.059			
ECON 055	50	40.12	5.752	0.813	2.09	87.27	0.040
ECON 101	50	43.10	8.296	1.173			
AEST 055	50	37.38	7.869	1.113	0.21	97.95	0.831
AEST 101	50	37.72	8.053	1.139			
SOCIAL 055	50	40.50	6.332	0.895	0.57	96.75	0.573
SOCIAL 101	50	39.74	7.096	1.004			
POLIT 055	50	41.34	6.592	0.932	1.86	97.94	0.066
POLIT 101	50	38.86	6.758	0.956			
REL 055	50	43.18	7.430	1.051	0.83	97.96	0.409
REL 101	50	41.96	7.276	1.029			

EPPS

Table 4 reports data on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Of the fifteen personality variables measured, a significant difference was found in only one area, ACH (achievement). Findings indicate that the 101 students were significantly more concerned with achievement than were the 055 students. Equal importance may be attached to the fact that a significant difference was also found in CON (consistency). The research indicates that the 101 students were more consistent in making their choices, thus posing the possibility that statistics obtained from the 055 students are not as valid on this particular test as data obtained from the 101 students on the EPPS.

TABLE 4
Analysis of EPPS

Variable	N	Mean	SD	SE _m	Separate t	Variance df	Estimate LS
ACH 055	50	13.12	3.761	0.532	2.18	98.00	0.031
ACH 101	50	14.76	3.745	0.530			
DEF 055	50	10.82	3.354	0.474	0.49	97.60	0.625
DEF 101	50	10.48	3.576	0.506			
ORD 055	50	10.84	4.391	0.621	1.61	97.99	0.111
ORD 101	50	9.42	4.436	0.627			
EXH 055	50	14.02	3.217	0.455	0.69	96.22	0.490
EXH 101	50	13.54	3.688	0.522			
AUT 055	50	13.88	3.403	0.481	0.10	88.21	0.924
AUT 101	50	13.80	4.811	0.680			
AFF 055	50	16.18	3.718	0.526	0.71	91.42	0.478
AFF 101	50	15.56	4.895	0.692			
INT 055	50	14.38	4.218	0.597	1.40	97.89	0.165
INT 101	50	15.54	4.082	0.577			
SUC 055	50	12.88	3.788	0.536	0.02	94.01	0.981
SUC 101	50	12.90	4.670	0.660			
DOM 055	50	11.90	4.670	0.660	1.06	97.96	0.292
DOM 101	50	12.90	4.769	0.674			
ABA 055	50	16.00	4.472	0.632	1.12	97.93	0.263
ABA 101	50	14.98	4.596	0.650			
NUR 055	50	17.26	4.337	0.613	0.27	95.37	0.785
NUR 101	50	17.52	5.128	0.725			
CHG 055	50	16.66	4.003	0.566	0.07	94.35	0.947
CHG 101	50	16.60	4.886	0.691			
END 055	50	13.40	4.481	0.634	0.44	92.30	0.657
END 101	50	12.94	5.776	0.817			
HET 055	50	14.60	5.043	0.713	0.67	97.46	0.506
HET 101	50	15.30	5.433	0.768			
AGG 055	50	13.66	4.327	0.612	1.09	95.17	0.277
AGG 101	50	12.62	5.150	0.728			
CON 055	50	10.16	2.590	0.366	2.65	89.46	0.010
CON 101	50	11.36	1.882	0.266			

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

In undertaking the project described in this paper, this writer was attempting to determine what, if any, significant differences exist in the areas of personality, problems, and values between English 055 students (the so-called remedial, under-prepared college students) and English 101 students. The reasons for doing this were apparent: colleges are admitting more and more academically poorly prepared students, and ways must be found to minister to the needs of these students.

Since the usual procedure is to test students academically and place them accordingly, it was decided by this researcher that students should be administered other instruments, instruments which could measure psychological areas not normally tested by teachers or academic advisors. The four instruments chosen were selected because together they measure a wide range of areas of student interest and because of their proven reliability and validity. The Willoughby Schedule measured self-esteem; the Allport/Vernon/Lindzey Study of Values measured values; the Mooney Problem Check Lists measured college student problems; and the Edwards

Personal Preference Schedule measured fifteen personality variables.

Several significant items were found. Self-esteem, as measured by the Willoughby, was found to be far lower in 055 students than in 101 students. This indicates that remedial students think less of themselves. It follows that they are in special need of encouragement if they are to be academically successful. Also significant were the results of the Mooney.

Although the Mooney results revealed no significant difference in the way English 055 students and English 101 students felt about finances and living conditions, adjustment to college, or home and family, there were significant differences in the other eight areas. The fact that the 055 students checked far more problem areas than the 101 students is a clear indicator that many of these 055 students are in need of counseling. Gordon (1950) has found that a direct relationship exists between the number of problems marked and the desire for counseling.

The Study of Values revealed a significant difference in the way 055 students and 101 students felt about economics. There were no significant differences in the other five areas. The fact that the 101 students placed a higher value on economics, or the economical, indicated that the group is more interested in the practical or the useful, perhaps in an education that stresses practical,

applicable knowledge. This information could be useful in developing a course of study for remedial English if the teacher takes into account the fact that the remedial student is not necessarily concerned with the practical approach to studying grammar. The remedial student might respond to situations that emphasize personal involvement.

The results of the EPPS reveal a significant difference in student attitude and achievement. The 055 students were less concerned with the need for achievement than were the 101 students. The manual for interpreting the EPPS variables defines achievement as the need to do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish difficult skills or something of importance, to be able to do things better than others, or to be an acknowledged authority. These results possibly relate to the Willoughby findings about self-esteem. The 055 students have lower self-esteem and less desire for achievement. Findings in these two areas seem to be related, although one can not say definitely that either factor is a direct result of the other.

The other significant area on the EPPS was consistency, which is not in itself a directly measurable variable, but which is instead a score based upon a comparison of the number of items checked in identical areas. An individual score less than 9 on consistency

indicates that the scores on the 15 personality variables may be questioned. The mean consistency score for the 055 group was 10.16; for the 101's it was 11.36. The t value revealed this variance to be significantly different at the 0.01 level. Therefore, although the 055's did not fall to the questionable score of 9, they did fail to be as consistent as the 101's. One explanation for this difference in groups could be the length of the instrument; another explanation could be that the 055's were less definite in their choices.

The major implication of this research is that there are enough areas of significant differences between the remedial students and the normal students to merit investigating alternative ways of teaching the remedial students. Cross (1971) maintained that the need now in higher education is not so much to educate a few for leadership roles but for more concern for individuals and a more broadly-based education. She said that the way to improve life for everyone is to educate the masses to their full humanity. Since higher education was never designed to educate the masses, pressures for change are obvious. Many young people entering college are those who are not really college material. The simplest solution so far has been to design and establish remedial programs in the hope of getting these students ready to perform standard academic tasks that constitute the traditional concept of a college education. Educators have

concentrated on changing students to fit what is offered without questioning whether the ability to do college work as presently defined is really the measure of the best education that can be offered to all students.

Cross maintained that experience with is and should be surveys indicated that college institutions should be doing better in absolute terms, that the present emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge in academic disciplines is over-emphasized relative to other important goals.

The major recommendation that this writer has to make as a result of the research described in this paper is that colleges and universities, especially WKU where this study was done, should take a careful look at the increasingly large number of new students who come to college with very poor academic credentials. These poorly-prepared, under-achieving remedial students should be tested psychologically as well as academically, should be made aware repeatedly of all the counseling services available to them, and should be placed in classes in such subjects as English and mathematics that have been designed to meet needs other than purely scholastic. Higher education, if it is to effectively help these students, must be flexible enough to develop programs which will benefit the whole individual. The English 055 student at WKU, who is now placed in a remedial class because of his ACT and CAT scores, should also be given

some psychological testing and counseling. English 055 classes should utilize group and individual counseling techniques in conjunction with the teaching of communication skills.

References

- Agress, L. Twelve years of English in six weeks. Improving College and University Teaching, 1979, 27, 116-120.
- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. Study of values (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.
- Bhatnagar, R. P. A study of some EPPS variables as factors of academic achievement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 107-111.
- Bird, C. The case against college. New York: David McKay Co., 1975.
- Coyne, J. & Hebert, T. This way out. New York: Dutton, 1972.
- Cross, K. P. Beyond the open door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Dudley, J. R. A remedial skills course for under-prepared college students. Journal of Educational Research, 1978, 71, 143-148.
- Dugan, W. E. Opportunity for all. In F. F. Harclerod (Ed.), Issues of the seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Edwards, A. L. Edwards personal preference schedule. New York: Psychological Corp., 1959.
- Glazier, T. F. The least you should know about English: Basic writing skills, form B. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- Gordon, L. V. The problems of two university populations. Educational Research Bulletin, 1950, 29, 209-215, 224.
- Gray, B. Q. On remediation at The City University of New York. College English, 1978, 39, 631-634.
- Hallmundsson, M. N. Teaching remedial English: The dictionary as textbook. College English, 1976, 38, 159-164.

- Hickson, R. H. & Driskill, J. C. Needs for achievement: Differences between honors and non-honors students. Journal of Experimental Education, 1970, 38, 37-38.
- McClelland, M. E. An investigation of selected non-intellectual variables and their relationship to college academic achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30, 2339A. (University Microfilms No. 69-20, 890)
- Milk vs. cream? Time, March 31, 1980, p. 39.
- Miller, M. E. A study of Western Kentucky University's remedial English program in the fall, 1975. Bowling Green, Ky.: WKU English Dept., 1976.
- Miller, M. E. A study of Western Kentucky University's remedial English program, part II. Bowling Green, Ky.: WKU English Dept., 1977.
- Mooney, R. L. & Gordon, L. V. Mooney problem check lists, form C--college. New York: Psychological Corp., 1950.
- Otto, W., McMenemy, R. A., & Smith, R. J. Corrective and remedial teaching (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Rezler, A. G. The influence of needs upon the student's perception of his instructor. Journal of Educational Research, 1965, 58, 282-286.
- Sanford, N. Loss of talent. In F. F. Harclerod (Ed.), Issues of the seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
- Wagner, G. On remediation. College English, 1976, 38, 153-158.
- Wilcox, T. W. The anatomy of college English. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Willoughby, R. R. The Willoughby schedule. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1931.